
BLM LIBRARY



88026582

THE FUTURE OF
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT
IN OREGON

Summary Of A Symposium
Held November 1, 1986
In Eugene, Oregon

Sponsors:

USDI Bureau of Land Management
University of Oregon

HD
243
.07
F878
1986



United States Department of the Interior

IN REPLY REFER TO

1120 (912)

ID: 8802658a

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

OREGON STATE OFFICE
P.O. Box 2965 (825 NE Multnomah Street)
Portland, Oregon 97208

#16289296

HD
243
.07
F878
1986

Dear Symposium Attendees and Other Interested Parties:

Our symposium last November, "The Future of Public Land Management in Oregon", was a rewarding experience for us. Based on comments we received, many of those attending agreed that the effort was worthwhile and that it stimulated new ideas and better communication.

We indicated at the symposium that we hoped to prepare and distribute summary notes of the proceedings. We did, in fact, promptly prepare the final draft but the project got hung up in final stages because of other pressing demands. We regret the delay but trust that this summary will still be of value to you.

Each person's statement was necessarily condensed, paraphrased and sometimes reworded in an attempt to preserve salient points and continuity in a relatively brief format. Our objective is to provide an easy-to-read review of the major points advanced during all the sessions, some of which were concurrent.

Thanks again to all those who helped make the symposium a success.

Sincerely,

Paul M. Vetterick
Associate State Director

BLM Library
D-553A, Building 50
Denver Federal Center
P. O. Box 25047
Denver, CO 80225-0047

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SESSION	SPEAKER	PAGE
Opening	Richard Gale	1
	John Moseley	1
	Paul Vetterick	2
A. Managing the Commons: Individual Responsibility in the Future of Public Land and Resource Management	Stanton Cook	3
	Bob Chadwick	4
	Dale White	5
	Linda Craig	6
	Open discussion	6
B: Uncle Sam in the Pacific Northwest: A Look Back and a Look Ahead	Richard Brown	8
	Tom Imeson	9
	Pat Amedeo	9
	Janet McLennan	10
	Open discussion	11
Luncheon Keynote Address	Bill Grannell	11
C. Community Stability and the Role of Public Lands and Resources in the Future	John Beuter	13
	Ray Doerner	14
	Richard Gale	16
	Open discussion	
D. Multiple Use in the 21st Century: The Future of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act	Carl Hostika	19
	Mel Clausen	20
	Gail Achterman	21
	Open discussion	22
Wrap-Up	Richard Gale	23
	Annabel Kitzhaber	24
	Paul Vetterick	25
	Ed Ciliberti	26

BLM Library
 D-553A, Building 50
 Denver Federal Center
 P. O. Box 25047
 Denver, CO 80225-0047

THE FUTURE OF PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT IN OREGON

[Summary notes of a symposium held in Erb Memorial Union on the campus of the University of Oregon in Eugene, Oregon, on November 1, 1986]

The symposium was sponsored by the Bureau of Land Management in Oregon and the University of Oregon. It commemorated the fortieth anniversary of the creation of the Bureau of Land Management and the tenth anniversary of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976. That act articulated the policies of retention of public lands; periodic and systematic inventories of public lands and resources; a planning process to project future uses; management on the basis of multiple use and sustained yields; recognizing the Nation's need for domestic sources of minerals, food, timber, and fiber, as well as the need to protect scenic, historical, ecological, environmental and scientific values, air and water resources, wildlife habitat, forage for livestock, the natural condition of certain lands, and opportunities for outdoor recreation.

SESSION OPENING

RICHARD GALE

Department of Sociology, University of Oregon

Presided during the opening general session of the symposium, introducing the following speakers.

JOHN MOSELEY

Vice President for Research, University of Oregon:

It is easily recognized that several departments at Oregon State University are deeply involved in subjects pertaining to natural resource management on the public lands, but so are various departments here at the University of Oregon. When it comes to policy issues, the University of Oregon has tremendous strengths to complement the expertise in the College of Forestry and other activities at Oregon State University.

Faculties in the University of Oregon's Departments of Social Sciences and Planning, Public Policy and Management have long records of looking into policy and social issues regarding forestry and timber dependent communities, history of resource development, and other subjects. Our biology faculty has done reforestation research. The faculty in the Department of Human Development and Performance is into ecology, and people in Leisure Studies and Services have been very concerned with tourism, a growing Oregon industry. We also have a law faculty to teach and do research on resource policy.

People from the Eugene District of the Bureau of Land Management have participated in University activities as speakers and as students. We are glad that BLM has initiated this symposium and are glad to be co-sponsors.

PAUL M. VETTERICK

Associate Oregon State Director, Bureau of Land Management:

One reason for scheduling the symposium was to commemorate BLM's fortieth anniversary and the tenth anniversary of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act.

Another purpose was to provide a different setting for BLM employees, the public, and various interests in Oregon to discuss subjects of a more general nature than usually is the case in day to day contacts.

Also, we want to get your sense of vision about what the future holds for our agency which is responsible for a quarter of the State of Oregon.

BLM was created 40 years ago, but its roots go back more than 200 years to the initiation of public land surveys. For many years the agency served as steward of the public lands, pending their eventual disposal by various means. We gradually evolved into an agency that manages the lands for long term productivity and retention.

Earth Day and the environmental movement of the 1960s and 1970s spawned legislative mandates governing resource management practices. These included the Geothermal Act, Wild Horse and Burro Act, Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, the Clean Water Act, Threatened and Endangered Species Act, Clean Air Act, National Environmental Policy Act, and others. FLPMA was just one of the group. There were judicial decisions and executive orders. In the mid-1980s we are just about in the process of fully assimilating these policy mandates.

We serve a number of publics or constituencies. One of these is the Federal Government, with its three principal branches - legislative, administrative, and judicial.

Another is the public, with its great diversity. There is a growing body of people who are knowledgeable about public land management. This is good, but expectations of one group may be in conflict with those of another group.

Our own employees are another constituency. They have diverse awareness levels, attitudes, and values. How they do their jobs is important to everybody.

The final constituency has no voice and has no vote. It is the land and resources for which we are responsible. It's our job to understand the impacts on those resources and to insure that the needs of those resources are accommodated so they remain a viable national asset. We respond to the public constituency, but we also have an obligation to inform the public of the limits of those resource uses.

Constituencies change. We need to look back to where we have been. There is an inscription at the National Archives that states, "What is past is prologue." We need to assimilate the past and then look ahead to the future.

We want to find new and better ways to meet the resource management challenges ahead. During the next ten years, change will occur at least at the same rate as during the past 10 or 15 years, if not faster. We want to use your collective wisdom and input to give us a better path or yardstick toward what the world should be.

Session A

Managing the Commons: Individual Responsibility in the Future of Public Land and Resource Management

In a 1968 article, "The Tragedy of the Commons," biologist Garrett Hardin identifies utilization of public lands and resources as one of a class of "no-technical-solution problems," that is, problems which arise when people try to avoid the costs of over-utilization of resources without relinquishing privileges. Hardin suggests that the solutions to these problems cannot be technological, but that they must be based on mutual coercions, agreed upon by the majority of the people affected.

Moderator: Bill Calkins
BLM Vale District Manager

Stanton A. Cook
Department of Biology, University of Oregon:

Arguments about how best to use land and resources held in common have been going on for a long time. Garrett Hardin's discussion of "The Tragedy of the Commons" at a meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1968 created such a stir that the article was published in Science magazine. This was somewhat unusual because the problem is more sociological than technological. Nevertheless, society seems to expect a technological solution to problems caused by overuse of resources.

When people use a common-access resource, they tend to exploit it unless someone determines the share of each. Freedom in the commons brings ruin for all. We preserve our freedoms within a framework of restrictions that we impose upon ourselves.

Historically in America, conflicts in resource use were avoided by westward expansion to previously little used resources. That period has been labeled the frontier economy, or the growth economy, or the cowboy economy. It corresponded to the era of world colonization. However, the frontier closed in on us, and in 1966 the transition from the cowboy economy to the spaceship economy was described by Kenneth Boulding. Expansion to unexploited resources is no longer possible. Now we are trying to solve the problems caused by the complexities of competing resource uses.

There was a time when it was thought that all public lands would pass into private ownership. The Sagebrush Rebellion is a symptom of that persistent belief. A certain amount of public ownership is, however, a very good thing. Public ownership is a context in which we are brought together as a society. It is a good thing to achieve the cooperation of all factions in working toward common goals. Admiring the Statue of Liberty isn't enough. We need to have our attention drawn to the primary resources on which we all depend, to agriculture and silviculture, to soil, water, and air. Even if all lands were privately owned, there still would have to be regulations to prevent despoilation of lands and waters.

Public management can offer a standard by which to compare the management of other lands. There are examples of good management, both public and private, but there are also instances of price-fixing, colluding, and gouging. Recently, the courts found some oil companies guilty of these practices and assessed heavy fines.

Advantages of having diverse organizations that pursue specific resource management issues, are that collaboration is required among them, that public awareness of resource values is developed, and that public knowledge is brought to bear on the solution of problems. Society as a whole benefits when public agencies apply enlightened resource management. Through the participating process, a consensus is developed that involves private citizens as well as managers of public and private organizations.

Before the public will participate in planning for management and, we hope, support the actions of BLM, it needs to know of the existence of BLM. This awareness would be enhanced if BLM had more signs that indicate which lands it manages. For instance, they would know where credit is deserved for good management practices, such as the exclosure to protect riparian values along Camp Creek, a tributary of the Crooked River.

Much can be accomplished through the democratic process. Individuals are more effective when they work as members of a group or team that picks causes, specializes in issues, monitors developments, initiates thrusts, plays by the rules, innovates solutions, prevents mistakes, and contributes toward public benefits.

When individuals have unrestricted and, therefore common access to a resource, the resource is inevitably degraded by individuals' taking more or from population growth. The only way to prevent the tragedy in a democracy is through mutually arrived at constraints on individual behavior. Avoidance of the tragedy involves recognition of necessity, choice of constraints and implementation of restraints and continued monitoring of the system.

Bob Chadwick Consensus Associates

It isn't necessary to gullibly believe everything that is heard. The so-called tragedy of the commons should be thought of as the opportunity of the commons. Garrett Hardin maintained that the world is finite, but actually it can be used in an infinite number of ways.

Loggers said they couldn't reserve buffer strips to protect riparian zones, but when society supported that practice, technological solutions were found to accomplish the objective. Technological solutions must come from social agreement.

Another example of adaptation was the conversion of gasoline service stations – that could no longer profitably check oil and tire condition or wash windshields when prices dropped – to travel centers that also sold groceries to make a profit.

Rather than 52 percent of Oregon being public lands, actually 100 percent is public. Private ownership is possible only so long as it doesn't impinge on society. All water and air are accepted as being public. Many contend that scenery is public. In Tokyo, builders of high rise offices compensate those deprived of sunshine. Private individuals everywhere can own land only at the whim of society. There is an increasing tendency to entertain the notion that the public has rights on private land, particularly forest land, whether as watersheds, wildlife habitat, or for recreation.

Humans have a desire to live everywhere, particularly as populations increase. This leads to conflicts, adaptations, and a host of systems for governing activities – democracy, communism, and many variations.

There is value in conflict, because it leads to resolution of problems and adaptation to situations. When people have differing points of view they can learn from each other.

Foresters who interface with change become more aware, more productive, and more responsible. Industries that face change adapt to become more productive and more profitable.

There is no tragedy in the commons today. Commons exist everywhere. Tragedy lies in using the word, in believing that things are limited, in viewing conflict as being negative rather than seeing it as a vehicle for adaptation, a vehicle for coming together and for using the wisdom to see the limitless nature of the resources we're dealing with. There's a lot of hope in public land management today. We have the goodwill interest of the public saying, "We want you to be responsive to our needs." Industry has demonstrated its ability to adapt once public wishes are stated and understood.

Democracy works when people are brought together and asked to solve problems, to develop community stability – social more than economic – based on finding resolutions that cause adaptations, increase productivity, and meet the best intentions of those concerned.

Dale White

Harney County Judge:

If it is assumed that the few people living in Harney County favor one concept and the many people in the Portland area favor another, population increases can achieve the metropolitan viewpoint.

According to Garrett Hardin, private ownership resulted from the abuse of public lands. According to the historical concept, then, the people of Harney County should still be able to manage the use of the public land there while Portland people would have no public lands to manage because they had already passed into private control. But that isn't the way it works.

The public lands may well have been commons from the time of settlement until the 1930s. During that time there may have been abuses by today's standards, although they weren't considered to be then. When discussing management of the public lands there is a tendency to talk about past occurrences rather than the kind of management that prevails today.

With the passage of the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), the public lands are no longer commons. Individuals no longer have the right to use public lands for any business purpose unless authorized to do so by the Bureau of Land Management.

In the business of government, each stockholding citizen has only one vote to influence the Congressional board of directors. Therefore, since each person has such a minute effect on the process, why not go back to the commons concept?

Abuses probably would result, because individual users don't see that their use imposes costs on other users. There are many more kinds of uses today than formerly, and the coordination of uses has become more complex.

There are many improvements in mitigating the conflicts of resource use. There are better grazing methods, better logging methods, better control of the use of wilderness areas. For Hardin's recommended mutual coercion to work, there must be a population that has mutual demands and goals and therefore must agree to mutual restraints and controls for the mutual benefit of all. However, it won't work on public lands where demands, uses, and goals of the population are not mutual and are even in opposition to each other.

The answer has to be a combination of technical solutions and coercion applied by the private operators and BLM against the conflicting needs of user groups, as dictated by the board of directors – Congress.

BLM must continue to manage the lands as Congress instructs, with the realization that voters will from time to time change the board which will then change the policies. No one will ever achieve his own ultimate selfish goal and there will always be a conflict with others who want to achieve their own goals. However, there can be comfort in knowing that there will always be a diversity of uses and that the land will be managed for the public good. We hope for new ideas that will lead to new solutions that are painless for all.

Since we can expect ever changing conditions and ever changing solutions, there is a need to realize that an optimal solution at one time may not apply at another time. Learning and readjustment will help protect the public lands of this Nation.

Linda S. Craig
Portland Audubon Society:

Garret Hardin explained that coercion is necessary to protect a commons from the ruin that will result from each individual user pursuing his own best interest.

The public lands of the United States ceased being an unregulated commons with the passage of the Taylor Grazing Act in 1934. They differ greatly from the commons of eighteenth century England that were owned by a small, relatively uniform agrarian community and used principally for grazing. American public lands are owned by 220 million people, only about .01 percent of whom graze livestock thereon and most of whom realize no direct personal economic gain from them. England's commons were unquestionably grazing lands, but our public lands have a number of competing uses – some of them mutually exclusive.

The Taylor Grazing Act, which regulated use of the public lands, was followed in 1976 by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, which acknowledged the owners' diverse objectives, with the commons to be managed for multiple use. However, management on the public lands hasn't improved as much as we would like. In 1984, it was estimated that 71 percent of the public rangeland was still classed in only fair or poor condition.

With the passage of those laws, we agreed to mutual coercion in managing the lands for resource protection and sustained yields, and we asked BLM to enforce the laws. Enforcement is the key, but it is incredibly difficult and problems are far from solved.

Hardin stated that the system must include both authority for the custodians and a mechanism for corrective feedback. FLPMA provides for interest-group influence on policy making and requires that BLM decisions be open to public scrutiny.

Review of BLM management by volunteer conservationists is one of the corrective mechanisms that Hardin said was needed. Their review encourages the BLM to do more in allocating forage for wildlife, protecting habitats of threatened or endangered wildlife, preventing soil erosion, increasing the potential for sports fishing, maintaining water tables and year-round water regimes, and in other conservation activities.

Rangeland improvement tours provide forums for discussion among ranchers, BLM managers and conservationists, but while all want what they consider to be good resource management, their objectives often differ. BLM has the task of balancing the views of all of the owners of the public lands.

SESSION A OPEN DISCUSSION

A concern was expressed that the time required to resolve conflicts through public discussion and involvement may be so long that some values are lost.

Bob Chadwick responded by observing that conflicts are inevitable, but that time is lost by maintaining opposing views rather than by determining ways to achieve both objectives, perhaps by innovative methods. He cited the need to protect endangered plants over deposits of nickel or Eight Dollar Mountain and methods to retain benefits of old-growth timber habitats as well as profitable timber harvests.

Another person said that technological solutions are just not available for some problems around the world, like the Sahara desert or erosion in Sumatra. Coercion and consensus aren't enough. We need to mix head and heart and devise rituals that let us realize what we're giving up and gaining. In response, Chadwick stated that if we don't believe that a process will work, it won't. We have to ask what do we do about the consequences of our actions?

Someone asked if the Forest Service and BLM are trying to develop lawsuit-free resource management plans.

Chadwick pointed out that public interests in Oregon are changing. Early residents made their livings directly from livestock forage, timber, and minerals. During the past 20 years, additional concerns have been expressed.

Industry has to acknowledge that the population is changing and is demanding that public and private lands be managed in such a way as to be responsive to their concerns. Environmentalists, on the other hand, are going to have to find a way to respect the rights of primary resource users. The situation has changed. How can we cope; how can we adapt?

Paul Vetterick asked panel members how they viewed the likelihood of a less controversial public attitude evolving within the next 15 or 20 years.

Stan Cook said that America is slowly moving from an ethic of exploitation to an ethic of husbandry that includes all resources. He said that a process of dialog is achieving the changes. Damage to the Camp Creek watershed occurred over a relatively short period of time, but it has taken 50 years to rehabilitate it. However, now there are many more people who are concerned, there are new laws, Nature Conservancy purchases areas to be protected, and, hopefully, these positive forces will achieve better resource management more quickly than heretofore.

Linda Craig said that public resource managers still have the major responsibility for balancing resource uses. Balance will probably be gained in small increments.

Dale White doubted that we would ever get comfortable with the management of the public lands, because there are always different viewpoints and degrees of knowledge. The only thing constant is change. Fletcher said that the morality of an act is the function of the state of the system at the time it is performed. There is a lot to be learned about how nature performs. Future controversies over resource management issues can be expected, but we can face the conflicts and come up with the best resolution possible based on the knowledge available.

Bob Chadwick said his experience shows that solutions do result from two points of view coming together, sharing information, and making wise decisions. The process of interaction, sharing values, noting differences, studying the mind-boggling questions of how to do the impossible, and using the infinite capacity of the mind to solve problems does result in acceptable problem resolution.

A person pointed out that scientific facts cannot be ignored in reaching conclusions.

Another defended Hardin by observing that in some situations technological solutions cannot solve social problems. He cited China's application of population control to improve living standards.

SESSION B

UNCLE SAM IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST: A LOOK BACK AND A LOOK AHEAD

Charles McKinley's book, "Uncle Sam in the Pacific Northwest: Federal Management of Natural Resources in the Columbia River Valley," was published in 1952. The author examined the responsibilities and interrelationships of ten Federal agencies, and explored various alternatives for and obstacles to interdepartmental coordination in Federal resource management in the region.

Panel members presented current views of Federal management of lands and resources.

Moderator: **ED CILIBERTI**

Oregon BLM Public Affairs Staff Chief

RICHARD BROWN

Professor of Northwest and Pacific History, Department of History
University of Oregon

Charles McKinley's book, "Uncle Sam in the Pacific Northwest: Federal Management of Natural Resources in the Columbia River Valley," is a tome of nearly 700 pages which was published by the University of California Press in 1952. It was a massive achievement, based primarily on hundreds of interviews he conducted between 1944 and 1948. There are 37 feet of shelf space devoted to his notes and files in the University of Oregon library. That material also served as the basis for a 555-page sequel, "Management of Land and Related Water Resources in Oregon," published in 1965 by Resources For the Future.

The first 14 chapters of "Uncle Sam in the Pacific Northwest" describe and analyze the programs and operations of Federal agencies. McKinley recounts frequent rows among the agencies in describing their conflicts and cooperation. A major chapter describes the Tennessee Valley Authority, as a basis for comparison.

The final three chapters set forth McKinley's conclusions. He rejects the concept of a Columbia Valley Authority for the Pacific Northwest, a topic of hot discussion in the 1940s. Instead, he proposed putting all water and power responsibilities in a new Columbia River Administration in the Department of the Interior. He also proposed all of the agencies that deal with land resources in the Department of Agriculture. In addition, to play a crucial role in coordinating planned natural resource development, there would be an appointed special representative of the President to make sure that actions would be in the interest of the region and the nation as a whole. This exemplifies his philosophy of regional resource administration and his profound belief in the integration of regional programs into national programs and objectives.

Although McKinley criticized many aspects of Federal administration, he also recorded his admiration of dedicated, hard working Federal administrators, many of whom he had gotten to know in the course of his research.

McKinley was professor of political science at Reed College, and was accorded honors by his peers at a national level. He was born in 1889 in South Dakota, got his BA degree from the University of Washington in 1913, and an MA degree from the University of Wisconsin in 1916. He joined Reed College in 1918. In later years he turned down a full professorship at the University of California, Berkeley.

Times have changed in the 34 years since McKinley wrote his first book. Public vs. private power has been replaced by other events and issues, for example. However, the book is a valuable contribution to an understanding of how administration of natural resources in the 1930s and 1940s contributed to the scenario of regional growth.

Recent historians contend that New Deal programs resulted in a surge of growth and economic independence for the West as a whole that was inevitably accompanied by a cost. Resulting powerful client blocs have steadily undermined the planning principles and conservation values that were so dear to McKinley.

Two remarkable books were published just this year. One is "Rivers of Empire" by Donald Wooster, and the other is "Cadillac Desert," subtitled "the American West and Its Disappearing Water," by Mark Reisner. Both authors raise profound questions about the long-term benefit of natural resource development in the West. Reisner cites the collapse of the Teton dam as an example not only of faulty design, but, more importantly, as a result of the bureaucratic will to power of the Bureau of Reclamation and the avarice of its client group, commercial irrigation farmers of eastern Idaho, whose political pressure in the absence of the kind of planning process McKinley desired, resulted in the construction of an unneeded dam.

McKinley's concept of planning is one that begins in the local offices of natural resource agencies, in conjunction with the legitimate concerns of the natural resource users, and in the context of national priorities established by an elected Congress and President.

TOM IMESON

Federal Affairs Manager, Pacific Power and Light Company

It is pretty clear that things have changed since Charles McKinley wrote "Uncle Sam in the Pacific Northwest."

Around 1950, BLM lands in western Oregon were subdivided into 110 sustained yield forest units, each large enough to support an average size sawmill. Those units were grouped into 12 master units, each supplying one marketing area.

By the late 1960s, the roles of BLM and the Forest Service changed dramatically. By then, they had to be responsive to any number of groups whose interest were in addition to those concerned with timber yields.

In the early days, conservationists were strongly opposed to monopolistic tendencies, and favored smaller industrial units. Those attitudes still prevail, but probably not so strongly.

The explanation of why things changed is tied to shifting needs, shifting power, and shifting roles of agencies, Congressional delegations, and population.

Interplay among organizations, agencies, courts, and Congress was a factor in the 1960s and 1970s. An example of this was the furor over classification of wilderness areas.

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1968 was kind of a public disclosure law that says that agencies should go through a certain process in reaching a decision.

From the point of view of a land manager, the job becomes a lot more complex, because it has so many elements, and it isn't always clear who is to be served.

Changes in conditions and goals always must be considered.

There always are shifting power relationships. Congress can rather easily change things, particularly in the appropriation process.

Trying to figure out how the lands managed by BLM and the Forest Service are to be allocated is an incredibly difficult process. Tension will continue to prevail, although perhaps not at former levels. Current unemployment gives a different emphasis than 10 or 15 years ago.

Bonneville Power Administration surveyed public opinion in a clear process that was helpful in projecting future needs. That's what must be done to properly manage the resources for which an agency is responsible.

PAT AMEDEO

Director of Governmental Relations in the law firm of Saltman and Stevens

Charles McKinley's book jogs us back to the realization that in Oregon our economic and environmental quality of life is not necessarily in our own hands. That was truer in the 1940s than today, but to some extent an elitism still exists with some members of Federal agencies and some members of Congress outside our region who attempt to make economic judgements about our region. It is incumbent on us to take that into consideration as we hope to develop our economic potential. This phenomenon is before us now in the form of National Forest Planning. There are attempts to engender public opinion and support and reaction to alternatives advanced in planning processes by the Forest Service but ultimately the decision rests with the elected government.

In contrast to the training of early land managers, those of today need skills in public speaking, writing, negotiation, and diplomacy. Congress in the 1940s must have been far different than it is now. Staffing has grown in direct proportion to public interest in decisions of the Federal Government and the size of the Federal Government. Although cumbersome, that isn't necessarily bad, but it requires different skills from federal employees.

I was fascinated by McKinley's observation that perhaps we should stop irrigating some lands in favor of others, and also about his observations about grazing fees. It must have been as hard to get increases in grazing fees back then as it is now.

The Federal-State relationship, which was largely ignored by McKinley, has matured over time out of necessity. The relationship has expanded in recent years, in part because of a greater appreciation of fish and wildlife resources. Recommendations of State biologists are relied upon by the Federal agencies in planning wildlife habitat management and in many instances are viewed as the ultimate authority in these areas.

The proliferation of a series of sophisticated special interest groups, including state government, has developed since McKinley's study. Those groups are effective in altering policies, but they also can be effective in stopping progress. There is a thin line between their usefulness and their ability to prevent positive change.

Another example of Westerners and their relationship with the Federal Government relates to Bonneville's role in shaping economic development of the West. There is a regional planning commission in the four northwestern states, which is an amalgam designated to protect their interests. We're probably better off since we have it, but its relationship with the Federal Government likely will always be strained.

The States have done more since the 1940s to gain more and more control in their economic futures by the development of special interest groups.

JANET MCLENNAN

Assistant Power Manager for Natural Resources and Public Services
Bonneville Power Administration

In addition to Charles McKinley's "Uncle Sam in the Pacific Northwest," interesting background information is contained in Jerry O'Callaghan's "Disposition of the Public Domain in Oregon" and Stephen A. Douglas Puter's "Looters of the Public Domain." The latter book describes nefarious schemes to acquire public lands through exchanges and fraudulence in homesteading. Puter spent 17 months in the Multnomah County jail during which time he wrote the book. He also tells how Senator Mitchell got his just reward for participating in illegal land activities.

We've come a long way since those days. Professor McKinley was a neighbor of mine. He was a dedicated, participatory citizen and activist with the agencies he wrote about. He was a member of BLM's advisory board and a long-time member of the Portland Planning Commission. He characterized a different kind of participation than we have today. Academicians and editors frequently served as the public conscience then, whereas now the various interest groups are quite sophisticated in their approaches toward altering policies.

Oregon has a government that is intensely public oriented. When I served on the Governor's staff there were more than 200 people who served on boards and commissions.

In McKinley's second book, about administrative federalism, he began to look at the relationship between State and Federal Governments. Both are becoming more sophisticated in planning, and that may cause us to lose touch with the public.

McKinley seemed to have a preoccupation with coordination of Federal agencies. He also believed in the efficacy of reorganization. We seem to have come closer to accepting and succeeding with existing organizations.

The Federal Power Act gave a role to states in planning power needs and migratory fish requirements. It represents collaborative planning.

BLM doesn't have that forced Federal-State integration, but there have been a multitude of legislative enactments and court decisions that govern its activities.

SESSION B OPEN DISCUSSION:

The discussion following the panelists presentations brought out the point that any agency is a conglomeration of people who endeavor to adhere to established policies but who appreciate the participation of the public in developing practical resource management plans.

The roles of public land managers have changed during the past 40 years, so that they now depend less on their own assessment of conditions and more on established guidelines and the wisdom and interests of others.

On many matters, the decentralized systems of resource management allow the local manager to make decisions. However, on major issues of broad concern, avenues are available to establish new policies and practices through consultation, influence, court action, legislation, and other means.

BLM and the Forest Service appear to respond somewhat differently to public participation, principally because of the Forest Service's more structured approach on a wider scale.

LUNCHEON KEYNOTE ADDRESS

BILL GRANNELL

Executive Assistant for the Association of Oregon Counties.

It is exciting to see this broad cross section of Oregon's community join in considering public land and resource management issues. It is good to look ahead, hopefully with some great vision and some acuity, toward the next century.

While visiting Monticello recently, I was impressed with Thomas Jefferson's vision and with his optimistic belief that the lands described by Lewis and Clark would contribute greatly to the Nation. The diaries of Harold Ickes, who was Secretary of the Interior when BLM was formed in 1946, indicate that he also was a person of great optimism who believed that the country's resources could be properly managed.

At the Harry Truman Library in Independence, Missouri, there is a long list of the incredible problems of worldwide importance that Truman faced in the 1940s. Despite the problems of the era, Ickes and Truman and others around them held the optimistic belief when the Bureau of Land Management was formed that anything could be accomplished that was good for the American people and that the resources could be entrusted to the new agency.

As a former newspaperman from Coos bay and a legislator, I got interested in how public finance works. It's interesting how all of this links together. What you are doing here today is linked to the public lands but also to the finances of the State and counties. It was no accident that because I was interested in public finance I became interested in public lands.

Aside from the public lands in Oregon, the remaining private lands would be about the size of New York or North Carolina. In some other states the proportion of public lands is greater than the 52 percent in Oregon. This limits the developmental opportunities that counties can take. The counties are linked to whatever occurs on the public lands. Many communities in our state are wholly dependent on public lands and their economic viability.

Local governments are involved in the kinds of activities that occur on the public lands, and they also participate in state and national legislative actions to protect their interests. Various laws prescribe that certain percentages of revenues from federal resource management are to go to the counties. In Oregon in 1986, revenues of about \$108 million will be paid to 33 counties from Forest Service revenues. About \$70 million from O&C lands will be paid to 18 western Oregon counties. An additional \$4 million will be derived from other land laws.

The state of Wyoming receives \$198 million from mineral revenues. New Mexico gets \$132 million from mineral revenues.

In Oregon, the payments from federal natural resource management revenues constitute a large part of county budgets. If all the public land had passed into private ownership, counties would have been entirely dependent on taxes.

Counties support consistent timber harvest levels, good forest management practices, fire suppression, and other beneficial resource management activities.

A year and a half ago a group met at the request of Congressional Research to consider revisions that would improve the Federal Land Policy and Management Act. There was broad representation from a wide variety of resource interests, but a final report was never prepared because no one was willing to modify previously held beliefs.

During the rest of this century there may be a change in how we look at things. We have a fervor to scientifically categorize and study all the phenomena of our environment, stratify our findings, and from all this draw some complex conclusions.

With a strong dash of adversarial politics, such plans for the future becomes a legacy. In such a controlled state of being, the optimism of Jefferson and Ickes fades.

One might wonder when finally all environmental concerns are tied up in a neat, tight little box, what will be left for the next generation to do.

Current planning by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management will set the allowable cut for at least the next generation. This will dictate the majority of Oregon's timber supply and change the economic strategies of the State's timber companies. If the prophecies of many are true, the allowable cut will be substantially less or, at best, flat. There will be little or no growth in the forest industry, which last year provided \$3.1 billion to the State's economy. Stagnation of this industry means economic stagnation for Oregon. For the rest of the State's industries, it means higher tax burdens. When you push the bubble on one side, it comes out on the other side.

This means that where there are limited finances, some public services will diminish, like roads breaking down or here and there a school closing. We've sought to stretch government resources to their maximum and have tried to make sense out of a government revenue system that is over-reliant on the property and income taxes.

Many of today's financial issues are wrapped around natural resources and Oregon's huge Federal presence. Oregon, its counties, and its schools are inalterably linked to the Federal government. How BLM and the Forest Service manage their land is of paramount importance to us. But confrontation politics, that I've witnessed between environmentalists and direct land users, is destructive and leads to stalemate and leads, quite frankly, to no answers.

Balance of interests and community spirit will allow us to work together to meet most of our needs on the remaining 730 million acres of public land. This will help regain the optimism of Jefferson.

Maybe we just need to renew the spirit of multiple use; it can happen in a community.

SESSION C

COMMUNITY STABILITY AND THE ROLE OF PUBLIC LANDS AND RESOURCES IN THE FUTURE

The O&C Sustained Yield Act of 1937, which articulates the guiding principles for BLM's management of forest lands in western Oregon, provides for multiple uses of the lands in a manner "contributing to the economic stability of local communities and industries." Providing timber to the wood products industries, and the resulting community stability, has been of major concern ever since. For the first two or three decades of management under the O&C Act there was general agreement with that emphasis. However, beginning in 1957, increasing emphasis has been given to reforestation, recreation, wildlife habitat, soil and water, grazing, and the coordination of those uses with timber production.

This transition stemmed from broader outlooks of professional resource managers, from local and distant people stressing the values of non-timber resources in contributing to community stability, and from the enactment of various laws that mandated environmental protection and multiple use resource management.

The panel members discussed the role of public lands in community stability and the responsibilities of BLM resource managers to contribute to the stability of local communities and industries.

Moderator: BOB DALE
BLM Coos Bay District Manager

JOHN BEUTER
Professor, College of Forestry, Oregon State University

I've studied community stability for about 30 years, but it seems that the more I study it, the less I know about it.

My first forestry assignment was in the vicinity of Captain Jack's stronghold, near the northern boundary of California. Three formerly bustling communities were disappearing, but an industrial well, 800 feet deep, still provided water in that dry country to fire crews, Indians, and passers by. When fire crews bought groceries in Tule Lake, the Forest Service policy was to alternate between the two grocery stores. This provided practical experience in maintaining community stability.

About ten years later, in 1966, Dr. Don Schallan and I were working for the Forest Service Experiment Station in Portland. As economists, we realized that we would have to address community stability. With help from a visiting professor, we explored alternative definitions of community stability. Communities generally follow cycles. There are stages of growth, with development of resources, export of product, attraction of capital, stages of family expansion, and construction of schools and towns. The problem is determining what can be done to keep it going.

In our studies, we tried to relate the welfare of communities to the timber resource. We considered the excess employment theory to measure dependency, in which we compared the distribution of employment in a community to the national distribution of employment. Some southwestern Oregon economic areas were found to be 90 to 95 percent dependent on timber.

From that, there is the inference that if we keep the timber flowing, we will preserve the economy and all will live happily ever after. That's imbedded in our forestry theory of sustained yield which we brought over from Germany and 500 years of European forestry tradition and subsistence economy.

In 1978, we wrote a forestry paper for the World Forestry Congress in Jakarta, Indonesia, called "Forests in Transition." There we tried to introduce the concept of stability in orderly growth or orderly decline, depending on the stage of the cycle. Communities should recognize that their growth or decline can be managed. This pointed out a perception, but really didn't get us anywhere.

Fortuitously, the next thing I got involved in was a study of the Lakeview sustained yield unit. In 1944, an act was passed by Congress that allowed the Forest Service (and BLM) to enter into sustained timber yield agreements. I had previously studied the Grays Harbor sustained yield unit, and wanted to see how the Lakeview agreement was doing.

At the turn of the century, the population of Lakeview was about 3,000 and the population of Paisley was about 300. Populations there are still about the same. That's stability, and one can argue that the agreement had contributed to it. In the unit there are four sawmills, and they have been there for a long time. They've reached stability in their operations. Lakeview presents the only example I've heard of where the community and the forest have achieved a nearly symbiotic relationship. The economy of Lakeview is largely supported by agriculture and lumber and other wood products, but the most significant part is government. That's the only part that has grown in the last 20 years and now provides one-third of the employment in the county.

Finally, in 1984 I worked for the Congressional Research Service in Washington, D.C., where I did an analysis to be used by legislators and others interested in Federal timber policies. I traced the laws affecting policies of the Forest Service and BLM, and found that they generally fostered some form of economic development and growth. Passage of laws like the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 has slowed that impetus. Concern has been expressed about below-cost timber sales in the Rocky Mountain areas, which require road building and other activities. The Forest Service justifies those sales on the basis of maintaining community stability - trying to keep timber flowing - and on the basis of other public use resource developments.

This indicates that the Forest Service looks at itself as a social welfare agency as well as a resource management agency, and it's not clear where that charter comes from, except by policy or tradition.

There is no clear legal, economic, or social definition of community stability, but Lakeview presents a good example.

The thing that I think we're going to change our minds about is whether or not it is the responsibility of resource management agencies to worry about community stability. We probably will move away from the idea that it is. Community stability is really the responsibility of the community. The agencies can show what might happen and let the community decide what to do about it. Communities need to get involved in the planning process, since the plans will influence their stability.

RAY E. DOERNER

Executive Director, Association of O&C Counties

As commissioner in a forest dependent county and while serving the Association of O&C Counties for the past ten years, I've developed a broader perspective about what public forests mean to the communities of western Oregon. A community is not just a political boundary, a population statistic, or a group of buildings. It is a living thing, serving useful purposes of the Nation as well as its own.

In western Oregon, 70 percent of the land is commercial forest land, and 55 percent of that is publicly owned. The physical magnitude of the forest makes it important, but it's products and services are really important.

Five special characteristics of the relationship between forests and communities make me expect great things from the public forest lands.

Communities in western Oregon have grown and developed in serving people's needs. Timber harvests build homes, provide paper for a multitude of uses, and produce many other useful and necessary products. Too many people believe that wood comes from the lumber yard and paper from the stationery store. Many people question the need to harvest trees at all. These misconceptions must be corrected if we are to maintain community stability and meet the Nation's increasing needs.

Oregon forests are productive now, but have the potential to produce much more. As a farm owner, I am aware of the potential to increase yields through intensive management by regulating the number of stems per acre, applying fertilizer, controlling weeds, and using seeds from genetically superior stock. We expect forest managers to be innovative and open-minded toward new intensive management techniques.

BLM lands in western Oregon are uniquely blessed with large volumes of mature timber which can continue to be a major source of revenue to carry out intensive management practices. Whereas a farmer has no return on his investments in a crop until it is harvested, investments in timber culture can be recovered sooner. As soon as the benefits of intensive management practices in increasing future yields is certain, the projected increased volumes can be extracted from the excess inventory of mature timber on hand. This is known as the allowable cut effect. Being familiar with this process, the O&C counties have reinvested one-third of their legal share of receipts in development, management, and protection of the two million acres of revested railroad grant lands. This investment, now in excess of \$600 million or \$300 per acre, is one of the reasons the lands are as productive as they are. This funding approach is similar to a corporation's procedure in plowing back a portion of its earnings into the productive capacity of the corporation. Stockholders - the citizens in this case - accept lower current dividends in exchange for continuing and higher dividends in the future.

Forests furnish many uses in addition to timber which contribute to the economy and livability of western Oregon. The counties are well aware of the need for carefully coordinated management and protection of the total resource to produce adequate water, minerals, wildlife, and recreation, as well as timber. The demand for them is growing, but their productivity can be increased by more intensive management, just as in the case of timber. I disagree with those who contend that recreation, hunting and fishing, tourism, and the like are incompatible with timber production. Certainly, scenic corridors and vistas need special silvicultural prescriptions. Tourists, I know, really get excited when they see a high-lead logging operation or visit a modern wood processing plant.

O&C lands from the beginning have been dedicated to the development and stability of local communities. Shared receipts became the name of the game with the passage of the O&C Act in 1937. The 50 percent of receipts available to the counties assists in stabilizing local government services, a necessary ingredient in any community stability endeavor. In most western Oregon counties, shared receipts from resource management form the centerpiece of their budgets.

In summary, public lands contribute to greater community stability by meeting the needs of the people, yielding larger harvests through more intensive management, providing a funding source for intensive practices, providing many compatible uses that contribute to livability, and providing shared receipts which stabilize local government services.

However, the situation is changing. More demands are being made on the forests. The rubber band is being stretched. There are going to be more conflicts, and they are coming to a head. Commodity groups are on a collision course. A large majority of county commissioners believe that the counties have gone far enough. Each time plans are developed, the commercial forest land base shrinks. We hope there will be enough land available for all purposes. It seems to me that we'll have to piggy-back one resource on top of others in order to stretch far enough to satisfy most people.

In closing, statistics show that there is about the same amount of standing timber on BLM lands in western Oregon now as there was in 1937. During that period, under sustained yield, more than 36 billion board feet of timber has been harvested and \$1.33 billion has been derived for the Federal Treasury and a like amount for the counties. In addition, there has been an incalculable economic turn-over in the various communities and the nation. So, with that sort of success, the Association of O&C Counties congratulates the Bureau of Land Management. You've done a fine job for 40 years. Conflict is inevitable as new plans develop, but we think BLM can meet the challenge.

RICHARD GALE

Department of Sociology, University of Oregon

"In the end, we all want the same thing, a stable economy and a raw materials base, but we are more concerned about our families and our communities than about a specific company's bottom line."

That quotation was from a group which a year ago shut down Florence, Oregon, for a day to protest an environmentalist's lawsuit against the Mapleton District of the Siuslaw National Forest. The group was Concerned Citizens of Western Lane County.

Community stability means different things to different people. Sociologists like to sort things, and here are four types of community futures, built on natural resource professionals' concept of ecological stability. These are community preserve, sustained yield community, let-burn community, and brush-patch community.

A community preservation perspective would attempt to maintain present levels of employment indefinitely, just as existing conditions are preserved in a wilderness area.

The sustained yield community type contrasts with the preservation type, just as a community that strives to maintain a viable, diversified economy and labor force contrasts with policies designed for community preservation. Sustained yield concepts realize that existing stocks will change over time, and intervention to effect change is appropriate. Many Oregon communities seek a non declining, ever flow of employment opportunities, rather than boom-bust cycles.

In the let-burn philosophy, lightning fires are allowed to burn unchecked in wilderness areas. Some people believe in the use of controlled burns to achieve ecological goals in managed forests. What then is a let-burn community? The wildfire-like automation which swept through the forest products industry paralleled the forest let-burn policy in its impact on resource dependent communities. Another example was airline deregulation.

In the brush-patch community, there is a low level of support for sustaining the community's natural resource base, without which the community becomes a brush-patch. Towns cease to exist. Forest managers are loath to allow forest lands to become brush-patches despite difficulties like those experienced on the coast in reestablishing conifers in alder and vine maple brush-patches. Resource based communities see their traditional resource base rapidly depleted and wonder what will replace it. Brush-patch communities also result from resource mining. Some people see a future in higher prices for alder and maple or in converting dying towns into tourist attractions.

Oregon communities adjacent to public lands fit into these four types. Some may alter their situations to improve their lot. Some may bounce back with alternative futures. I am not sure of the long term viability of the preservation type communities, given the international changes in resource systems. Most interesting is the possibility of the emergence of a community based pressure for a sustained yield economy and for more clearly community directed resource policies.

Another quotation is, "The Alaska state government is single minded in its efforts to promote and market the commercial and sport salmon fishery. Oregon state government backs away from resource production." The speaker was a state senator from Newport, Oregon.

Do natural resource managers have a social function? Natural resource management can either be targeted toward a specific social group or not. Some legislation requires such targeting. There aren't many examples, but Lakeview is one, although some contend that the 1944 act was unconstitutional. Nevertheless, targeting happens all the time. Timber sales are designed in a certain way in anticipation of expected demands. There are primary harvest, preharvest, salvage, ecosystem rehabilitation, product development, secondary product development, market and nonmarket uses, and an increasing array of natural resource programs. Similarly, there are lots of discussions of implicit market targeting, such as stewardship contracting and wood residue salvaging.

With the withdrawal of the Federal presence due to budgetary limitations and for other reasons, there is a hole there that some counties and communities and states will fill.

SESSION C OPEN DISCUSSION

These condensed comments are drawn from the discussion that ensued following presentations by the presentations of the four panelists regarding Community Stability and the Role of Public Lands and Resources in the Future.

In court actions, it has been difficult for communities and states to legally protect jobs for their own people or to protect their own resources for themselves. However, despite the general constitutional problem, you see examples around the country where resource management policies are specially targeted to benefit certain groups. Unemployed Maryland fishermen are given State jobs in fishery habitat enhancement. Lobstermen on Cape Cod are permitted to work community offshore areas only if they are residents of that community.

Logs shipped to Japan are reportedly sometimes distributed to local mills in Japan to promote their community stability.

Fluctuation of allowable timber harvests of a few percentage points will have relatively little effect on community stability.

In Lakeview, mills are required to produce finished products that do not require further remanufacture.

The trend toward secondary processing will provide growth opportunities for industries in western Oregon. The problem is that unless there is a new product developed, existing plants elsewhere can produce established products more cheaply. When a midwestern wood processing plant becomes so obsolete it has to be rebuilt, maybe the company will move to Oregon.

For many years following the depression, Federal timber was withheld from the market to avoid lowering the prices of private timber. Public timber was metered out, encouraging the harvest of private timber. Now it will be 20 or 30 years before new crops of private timber are mature. Communities will need all they can get from the public lands during that period. By the year 2010, the private lands will be back in production and the pressure on public lands will not be so great.

There has been a 25 percent job loss in the forest products industry since 1977, and, in addition, wages are being lowered. Such lack of community concern on the part of wood products companies should be considered in this process. Competition is tough. Mechanical efficiency has increased. Perhaps wage concessions had to happen or there wouldn't be any jobs there at all. Fishermen in eastern Canada couldn't make any money, so the Canadian government provided some relief. Lack of competition for timber in Lakeview probably results in loss of revenue, but if it weren't for the cooperative agreement the mills might not be there at all.

If the concept of community stability through cooperative sustained yield agreements envisioned between 1937 and 1948 had been fully implemented, there might not have been as much competition as has prevailed since that time.

Sustained timber yields do create community stability, but other resource uses also contribute toward that goal under the umbrella of the O&C Act.

Sustained yield is a legitimate goal. Carl Shurtz, former Secretary of the Interior, said, "Ideals are like the stars. We never reach them, but they are there to guide our way." Sustained yield involves balancing age classes to achieve a relatively even flow of timber.

If out-of-state influences try to change the formula for distributing O&C receipts, the western Oregon counties have a strong case. Those lands are held in trust for the communities of western Oregon. The counties have invested \$600 million in those lands. Some people contend that the lands should not ever have gone back to the Federal Government.

In Douglas County, the combination of federal and private lands in determining allowable harvest levels would result in increased total volumes available for harvest each year.

Had a cooperative sustained yield unit been established in Coos Bay, it is unlikely that the present decline in employment would have been alleviated. Developments in transportation have tended to erase differences between localities.

Harvest of presently mature public timber during the next few decades probably will not greatly affect the volumes available to harvest thereafter on a sustained basis if the allowable cuts have been properly calculated for the area under consideration.

Declining to harvest old-growth timber for 30 years theoretically might make it more valuable then, but actually it may be hard to sell then because of changes in mill equipment and deterioration of the timber. Probably some should be retained for various reasons. Community stability and welfare depends on a mix of resource uses and values. Manufacturing techniques have developed good quality products from raw materials of lower quality than formerly available.

There is a lot of hardwood in Oregon, but it is widely scattered. Some lands can be managed for hardwoods, often in riparian zones where alder does well.

Public forestry agencies sometimes have an opportunity to benefit local communities without great effort, but there are dangers of becoming entangled with the expectations of other groups.

National standards are designed to prevent local abuses or expectations from people who live adjacent to public lands. Public timber belongs to the public, not to individuals who seek to influence management to suit their personal desires.

SESSION D

MULTIPLE USE IN THE 21ST CENTURY: THE FUTURE OF THE FEDERAL LAND POLICY AND MANAGEMENT ACT

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 established basic policies for management of the public lands under the administrative jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

Panelists reflected on accomplishments during the first decade of the law's existence, and assessed BLM's readiness to anticipate opportunities and challenges that lie ahead. They referred to varying expectations from multiple use and sustained yield policies, as well as to ever-changing conditions.

Moderator: DAVID JONES
BLM Medford District Manager

CARL HOSTICA

Associate Professor, Department of Public Policy and Planning, University of Oregon

My interests stem from academic affiliations, from being a member of the Oregon Legislature, and as an individual citizen. I want to talk about the role of the land manager in making decisions.

Although the 21st century is only 14 years away and seems near at hand, if we look back 14 years we will realize that things are changing very rapidly.

Managers will have to make decisions at the local level, and those decisions will be essentially policy decisions that are in the nature of balancing social interests. Multiple use is a social concept as much as a technical or biological concept.

Remote political leadership will be hard pressed to give more specific guidance than that contained in FLPMA.

There will be increasing conflicts and pressures with increasing population and increased emphasis on "uses" of the land that involve keeping it in a more or less natural condition. There will be increasing demands for such things as fish habitat, water quality protection, and dispersed primitive recreation. Those will be in conflict with commodity interests and with local governments that have a revenue stake in what happens on the public lands.

Conflicts will become more intense because the demands increase as the supply decreases. For example, current discussions revolve around how much old-growth timber should be excluded from harvest and perpetuated for other reasons.

What methods for decision making are there? We seem to be focused on biological or technical methods for resolving conflicts. We define uses in quantitative terms, inventory resources, and attempt to develop plans to sustain those uses.

In my view, the spotted owl is a symbol of a social conflict between people interested in natural forest conditions versus those with commodity interests. I don't have any faith in the assumption that getting more technical information about the requirements of spotted owls will resolve the social conflict.

Technical problem solving can't deal with the evolving social definition of what is use and the evolving social priorities among uses as conditions change.

Another method for resolving conflicts is the economic method, which selects the course of action that results in the greatest economic benefit over the long haul. Instead of measuring results in terms of technical production of board feet, millions of gallons of clean water, or visitor days, they are measured in dollars. This also does not take into consideration the changing social values, nor can it measure the quality of life provided by the resources and the value of that quality of life to the economic health of a community. Forests and rangeland are essential elements in trying to diversify the economy, and provide reasons for people wanting to live in Oregon, even though they have no direct work connection with basic commodity production. Standard economic analyses can't accurately measure the social values inherent in natural resources.

In the end, we will be forced into making decisions based on political criteria. The political decision maker's job is to manage the conflict of interests and find solutions that will resolve the differences and accommodate enough of the interests to keep society from increasing the level of conflict.

Land managers will have to think of themselves as not only managing land but as managing social conflict as well. They need to seek to meet the various interests rather than pitting them against each other and keeping score as to who wins. As an example of the kind of solution that should be sought, perhaps more intensive management of young timber stands, closer utilization and more complete manufacture of timber that is harvested, developing markets for species that are little used at present, greater efficiency in operations, and other similar measures might reduce the demand for harvest of old-growth timber.

Land managers are not going to be able to avoid conflict. The current process is not going to resolve the questions of the social conflict. Managers will have to be as much politician as resource manager.

MEL CLAUSEN

Eugene District Manager, Bureau of Land Management

During past decades, people traveling from the rich grain fields of the midwest to the truck farms of California have considered the rangelands and deserts in between to be of little value or interest. BLM resource managers of 30 years ago were faced with the challenge to manage what was actually a tremendous asset, but they had little direction.

During the 1950s, the professionally trained range managers and foresters had a lot of pride in their abilities and their interests in the environment, in ecology, how plants and animals interact, and the value of the resources. Their actions weren't challenged much. Older BLM people had passed the flag to the new generation of managers, with confidence in their technical abilities and dedication to public service. For about 20 years, BLM managers largely determined how the resources were used.

Then came the Federal Land Policy and Management Act. There were some mixed emotions in the agency. Managers generally were excited. All of a sudden, America had spoken through the legislative process, recognizing the tremendous asset embodied in the resources of the public lands. More thought had to be given to their management, rather than to the possibility of their eventual disposal to other agencies or owners.

A second emotion was disappointment in that maybe people thought BLM hadn't been doing a very good job of managing the public lands. It seemed that people thought BLM resource managers had little environmental concern and didn't understand ecological relationships or the reasons for having plant cover to protect the soil. Resource managers who thought they were acting responsibly were miffed when the new law intimated that long range planning was to be inaugurated to fill a void. Back in the 1960s, there was little public interest in planning, with only a few individuals attending scheduled public meeting. After FLPMA was passed, there was a great deal more interest.

BLM resource managers had little knowledge of psychology or how to handle public meetings or how to get people to work together or how to draw out their ideas or how to prevent conflict when opposing factions were present. Having the new hat of managing public involvement introduced still another emotion along with professional pride and disappointment in lack of public appreciation for past efforts. There was much frustration about how to proceed, particularly before the planning regulations were issued, but after as well.

About the same time, other professionals in addition to foresters and range managers were being hired. They were specialists in wildlife habitat, hydrology, botany, archaeology, landscape architecture, engineering, wilderness, recreation, and other aspects of broadened concepts of resource management.

Thus, managers were faced with heightened public interest in a much greater variety of resource uses. Initially, they were not well prepared to deal with these added dimensions of their responsibilities.

As BLM moves ahead, officials will improve their skills as people managers. They will be more concerned with the social impacts involved in all the varied uses of the lands, including the ability to breathe the clean air, see the open space, or to protect the soil. It's a much broader picture than was seen 30 years ago and a lot more people are looking at it, more closely than ever.

GAIL ACHTERMAN

Attorney with the law firm of Stoel, Rives, Boley, Fraser & Wyse

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act embodied a lot of the philosophy that BLM was already implementing on the public lands. That philosophy was that the lands were to be managed using a rational, scientific management process that emphasized land use planning and public participation.

People in the Department of the Interior assumed that once BLM got an organic act, something the Forest Service had but BLM didn't, it would form a foundation that didn't exist before. For example, in the 1940's the senator from Nevada prevailed on Congress to not appropriate any funds for BLM. Ranchers got together and paid the BLM range managers' salaries. When FLPMA was enacted, the assumption was that BLM could grow in ways that it couldn't before. Reality has not quite met expectations, for a variety of reasons.

There were tremendous delays in the implementation of the act. Two weeks after enactment, there was a change of administration, and it was well over six months before a new director of the Bureau of Land Management was appointed. Leadership was lacking to implement the new act, and Secretary Cecil Andrus' reference to the "Bureau of Livestock and Minerals" didn't help. When James Watt became Secretary of the Interior, there was another flip-flop in attitudes and methods. Watt did draw increased public attention to natural resource issues, creating more awareness of BLM than existed previously.

BLM manages three times the amount of land that the Forest Service manages and historically has gotten about one-fourth the appropriations. Worse yet, in recent years the appropriations for all natural resource agencies have been reduced. There are so few BLM employees that some range conservationists may see grazing permittees only once a year. When FLPMA was enacted and the California Desert Conservation Area was created, there was only one law enforcement person for the entire California Desert to prevent theft of archaeological artifacts and enforce other laws.

The problem, however, goes beyond lack of funds and personnel. One of the other problems embedded in FLPMA and the National Forest Management Acts is that they are very process oriented. The whole land use planning system is set up as a process, but with very few substantive guidelines. This leads to interest-group brokering. All too often that results in a bad decision or no decision. A good process doesn't guarantee good decisions.

Samuel Hayes' book, "Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency," explains that multiple use that seeks to accommodate all competing interests may result in the lowest common denominator. Brokering interest groups and use demands results in satisfying nobody and doing a poor job of managing any particular use.

There seem to be two major proposed cures for this perceived malaise. One is the biological-technical-economic approach which calls for increased professionalism. If more specialists in all the categories involved could just join their talents, they could do a better job at rational resource management.

However, the real answer seems to be for the land management agencies to use the political process better and to increase their participation manipulation in a political process.

There is another theme that goes alongside these approaches to better resource management by the agencies involved. Marion Clawsen, BLM's first director, during a symposium a few years ago, posed five alternatives for the future of the public lands. I reject four of the five, but they are:

1. Most or all of the present public lands will be retained in public ownership, but strenuous efforts will be made to improve their management.
2. The public lands could be turned over to the states, with their eventual disposal to be determined by the state;
3. Most public land could be sold;

4. Most public lands could be transferred to public corporations or mixed public-private corporations, to be managed as decided by those corporations;

5. Long-term leasing of public lands could be greatly extended, not only as has been done for mineral leasing, but for other uses as well.

Despite the academic discussion of the last four alternatives, it hasn't happened yet and I don't think it's going to happen now.

I don't think any panaceas exist. Neither greater professionalism nor more participation in the political process will achieve the best result. The only thing sure is that changes will continue to be gradual rather than dramatic. Future decisions about the public lands will be value judgments, not technical resource values nor natural resource economic values, but on the value perceptions that people in our society have.

In grappling with resolving different values in a way that's acceptable to society, political skills must be used. Public land managers themselves who have the expertise in technical areas, who have spent years trying to resolve these problems, who are trained in this area, need to exercise more leadership. They need to provide more substantive guidance and goal direction necessary to get the groups to resolve, together if possible, their differences in values. If you don't have leadership coming from the best informed people in society on these issues, you're going to end up with the lowest common denominator, brokering of interest groups, and no one's going to be happy.

I've never been enamored with litigation as a way of solving anything, but it is interesting to note that there are only 36 reported cases under FLPMA, including about one-third that deal with the constitutionality of mine reclamation and cost recovery provisions on rights-of-way. So there haven't been many cases that deal with fundamental value conflicts on allocation of the public lands. My view is that litigation isn't going to resolve these fundamental societal issues. We need to think about value differences and about enlightened leadership to resolve them.

SESSION D OPEN DISCUSSION

After panelist presentations on the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, the following points were raised during open discussion.

The best mix of resource uses in one BLM district may be quite different from the best mix in another district. That depends on many factors, including resource availability, economic considerations, population, recreation attractions, environmental values, etc.

During statewide hearings relating to establishing minimum stream flows, the preponderance of local testimony opposed the concept, but the relative importance of other views had to be considered. This type of situation makes it difficult for a local manager to reach an objective decision.

If the different interest groups get together on a specific piece of ground, they usually can agree on a solution to the problem. Polarization more often develops when discussions are remote from the locale of the problem.

If the perception is that managers are oriented toward commodity production, it could be that the majority of citizens are also oriented that way.

Policy mandates must be observed even though they represent changes in direction that are not universally accepted.

We need technology and we need litigation under certain circumstances, especially when the consequences of proposed actions can't be fully determined in advance.

FLPMA provides statutory authority for BLM to perform research, to maintain inventories, and to identify new and emerging values but funding is a problem. BLM specialists research certain potential problems and undertakings. BLM also funds research by universities and the Forest Service.

Recognizing the relative preeminence of uses on a given area may help people to accept the concept of multiple use, a quite complex subject. To consider only one dominant use of an area probably is an over simplification, because other uses tend to be ignored even though they exist.

Consideration of repealing the 1872 mining law was deliberately eliminated during legislative deliberations leading to FLPMA, because its controversial nature might have forestalled enactment of any law at all. Recordation was substituted as an objective to be achieved.

There is no question but what the 1872 mining law is antiquated. It is silly that the Federal Government gets no revenues from hard rock minerals, although it does from oil and coal. However, the political reality is that the law will not be drastically revised for a long time. Fortunately FLPMA requires recordation of claims and environmental control of mining operations, thus addressing two important previous problems. Mining claimants still have freedom to prospect and stake claims, which often conflict with other resource uses. The argument is always advanced that only by allowing unrestricted prospecting and removal of minerals without paying royalties will scarce but vital minerals be found and made available for use.

WRAP-UP SESSION

At the conclusion of the day's activities, three commentators shared their observations of the presentations, all of which pertained to "The Future of Public Land Management in Oregon." Special emphasis was given to individual responsibilities, federal involvement in resource management, community stability, and multiple use under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976.

Moderator: ED CILIBERTI

Public Affairs Staff Chief, Oregon State Office, Bureau of Land Management

RICHARD GALE

Department of Sociology, University of Oregon

Reviewing Charles McKinley's book, "Uncle Sam in the Pacific Northwest," resulted in a lot of discussion about the integration of Federal agencies. McKinley described a proposed Columbia River Administration that would be a sort of super agency responsible for integrating the management of all natural resources. He recommended the appointment of a special representative of the President to insure that operations would benefit the Nation as a whole. Those kinds of things have not come to pass. We still do not have a United States Department of Natural Resources.

An interesting aspect of current proposals concerning the Hanford nuclear installation is that both Oregon and Washington are scrambling to put together a new coalition of agencies. From a sociological perspective, McKinley had a lot of early thoughts about what we could do with natural resource agencies to change them.

Since McKinley's book was published, an interesting development has been the emergence of the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management as major constituencies in and of themselves. However, one of the problems faced by Federal administrators is the public's difficulty in accepting the differences that exist between different agencies.

Along with Federal agencies, State agencies are now major players in natural resources issues. The integration of State and Federal relationships can sometimes be called cooperation, but other times it is not.

Some discussion revolved around relationships between the Bonneville Power Administration and the Northwest Power Planning Council. One purpose of the Council seems to be to put pressure on Bonneville Power Administration, to perhaps bring it to some kind of accountability. There are other examples of similar public councils, such as those concerned with marine fisheries. They consult about allowable harvests of fish. Some would rather depart from sustained yield than face foreclosure of their boats.

There is no single regional multiple use council that considers limits of various uses, but we may see more public councils concerned with specific uses. Some people argue that we should have more of the public council form of natural resource management, but others argue for less. Some people contend that since the members of the Northwest Power Planning Council and the regional Fisheries Management Councils have not had Senate confirmation, they are illegal and should not wield the power they currently do. Nevertheless, we may see more of these quasi-public councils emerge.

Public interest groups are becoming very professionalized. Some journalism and law students are attracted to such groups for employment. Issues are more complex, and it is becoming more difficult for traditional publics to become involved. One complicated issue is the linkage between salmon in the Columbia River and the sustained flow of electric power to California.

Agencies, and universities as well, currently are under budgetary constraints and regulatory constraints. But that doesn't mean that the public is no longer interested. A sense of community may bridge the gap and bring local populations into the support of natural resource agencies in new ways.

Lakeview is one of the few places where natural resource agencies are mandated to bring stability to the community. Different people have different definitions of community. For example, are Lebanon and Sweet Home part of the Portland community? Similarly, there are some ties between Eugene and Florence.

O&C lands are like tuna fish. Tuna were exempted from consideration in the fisheries management system applicable within the 200-mile outer continental limit, in part because they range more widely but also because of the strength of the American tuna boat owners' association. However, conditions have changed, and the tuna fishermen are now seeking more controls. The future of O&C lands in part will depend on the extent to which it can be demonstrated that the special policies that are in effect are really benefitting and sustaining these dependent communities.

ANNABEL KITZHABER

League of Women Voters

The League of Women Voters is supposed to have an objective, broad view of controversial issues, to examine all sides of an issue, and come to a consensus. After listening to very divergent views about managing our public lands, it seems to me that there is a tremendous need for such consensus.

I learned a great deal in the two sessions that I attended and regret that I couldn't attend the other two sessions held at the same times.

It was interesting to hear how the Bureau of Land Management is evolving and how it meets the challenges that are being posed. BLM people are proud of their agency, and feel that they have a real function to perform in managing the resources of the public lands for the public good. They have been trained as professionals in resource management, but now have to resolve conflicts between people who have different notions about what they want from the public lands.

Another interesting idea is that the public itself hasn't been very much aware of what we mean when we talk about public lands. The public recognizes National Forests and National Parks, but has little knowledge or appreciation of the public lands that BLM manages. But, gradually, the public is becoming more aware of what the public lands are and the problems they pose.

Managing the public lands is a complex process, further complicated by funding problems that spread available capabilities very thinly. Revision of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act probably is not necessary, but it hasn't been fully implemented yet for various reasons.

Some problems in managing public lands were pointed out. An undercurrent of conflict was evident, with some deficiencies and abuses and some accomplishments and successes cited. On one hand, some people think the resource is not being managed in the best interest of environmental concerns, in preserving rather than destroying it. On the other hand, there is a feeling that people charged with managing the resource are doing the best they can and are not being fairly judged.

The various publics want different things from the resources of the public lands. We used to believe that technical scientific solutions could be found for problems of resource management, but the consensus during our discussions seemed to be that today's conflict problems are mainly social problems. People are not agreeing on what they want. The economy is important and must be considered in determining what is possible.

The idea was advanced that conflict is important because it can lead to resolution of problems. Conflict makes us examine problems together, to find how we can work together. Confrontation doesn't help in finding a consensus.

BLM people are going to have to become adept in helping people come to social and political decisions concerning appropriate balances in resource management. People sometimes become logged down in semantic mud. People worried about the economy on one side and others worried about the environment on the other side are going to have to come together and look for a way to come to some kind of an agreement in solving the problem. Most people want to preserve environmental quality; how to do it is the problem.

PAUL VETTERICK

Associate Oregon State Director, Bureau of Land Management

Free, unbridled, unconstrained access to common resources always results in abuse and over-exploitation. History is replete with examples of that having happened where there were no economic or regulatory restraints. Ultimately, the resource suffered.

To quiet the complaints, the Sheriff of Nottingham divided the commons among the users, to live or die as best they could alone. Even today, some people would handle grazing management systems in a similar fashion.

A certain amount of public ownership is necessary and is valuable to society.

Conflict, if properly managed, can be a good thing. It can lead to new ideas. It can bring people together. It can lead people to question traditional knowledge and beliefs. It may, in fact, promote collaboration, particularly when mechanisms for change are there.

We've reached a point in society where exploiting the tangible commodity resources is being tempered with a different value system. We're now dealing with how people value the various resources.

One conventional wisdom is that the Federal Government is responsible for community stability, but who really is responsible? It's the community, however it is defined, whether on a national, state, regional, county, or city level. Certainly, Federal activity is going to affect the community where the Federal presence has a major social or economic impact.

Federal revenues contribute to state and county schools and roads and things that make life better for all of us. Payrolls and jobs aid community stability.

Because of the provisions of the O&C Act, the eighteen western Oregon counties have a unique proprietary interest in the O&C lands.

Timber is important and always will be important to the State. Our task is to maintain a standard of living and a flow of revenue, but at the same time to be sure that we don't do that at the expense of decimating fish or wildlife or the other amenities that also are very valuable to this State and are, in fact, the commons.

ED CILIBERTI

Public Affairs Staff Chief, Oregon State Office, Bureau of Land Management

I want to thank Dick Gale of the University of Oregon, Dan Bowman of BLM's Eugene District Office, and Phil Stanbro of BLM's Oregon State Office for putting this symposium together.

Paul Vetterick set the tone in the beginning of the meeting when he mentioned the Bureau of Land Management's four primary constituencies: Federal administration, the diverse publics, BLM employees, and the lands and resources they manage. There is a fifth constituency that we haven't talked about, although it may be the most important. It is the future generations who ultimately will judge how well we as a society have managed the public lands in our care now.

Hopefully, today's ideas and discussions will contribute to all of us being better prepared to pass the trust of stewardship on to future generations, with the lands being in as good or better condition than they were when given to us by our forebearers.

Form 1279-3 (June 1984)		BORROWER	
USDI - BLM		HD 243 .07 PB1	
DATE LOANED		The Future of management in	
BORROWER			

BLM Library
D-553A, Building 50
Denver Federal Center
P. O. Box 25047
Denver, CO 80225-0047

